

# UC San Diego

## UC San Diego Previously Published Works

### Title

Rapid and Accurate Pressure Sensing Device for Direct Measurement of Intraocular Pressure.

### Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/6tf3p9st>

### Journal

Translational vision science & technology, 9(3)

### ISSN

2164-2591

### Authors

Gopesh, Tilvawala  
Camp, Andrew  
Unanian, Michael  
et al.

### Publication Date

2020-02-01

### DOI

10.1167/tvst.9.3.28

Peer reviewed

# Rapid and Accurate Pressure Sensing Device for Direct Measurement of Intraocular Pressure

Tilvawala Gopesh<sup>a</sup>, Andrew S. Camp<sup>b</sup>, Michael Unanian<sup>a</sup>, James Friend<sup>a,1</sup>,  
Robert N. Weinreb<sup>b,\*</sup>

*<sup>a</sup>Medically Advanced Devices Laboratory, Center for Medical Devices, Department of  
Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, University of California, San Diego, 9500  
Gilman Drive La Jolla CA 92093-0411 United States*

*<sup>b</sup>Shiley Eye Institute, The Viterbi Family Department of Ophthalmology, University of  
California San Diego, 9415 Campus Point Dr, La Jolla CA 92093*

---

## Abstract

**Purpose:** Intraocular pressure (IOP) is the primary modifiable risk factor for glaucoma. Current devices measure IOP via the dynamic response of the healthy cornea and give limited or inaccurate measurements when biomechanical properties are altered. We seek to develop and test an accurate needle-based, real-time IOP measurement device that is not cornea dependent.

**Methods:** Our device combines a high-resolution pressure microsensor with 30- and 33-gauge Luer lock needles to provide IOP measurements via microcontroller and USB interface to a computer. The device was calibrated in a closed membrane chamber then tested and validated in the anterior and vitreous chambers (post-vitrecomy) of rabbit eyes. Readings were taken across a pressure range of 0–100 mmHg, increased in 10 mmHg increments, and were compared to Tonopen readings.

**Results:** Both the needle based sensor device and the Tonopen demonstrate a linear relationship with changes in imposed pressure. The Tonopen was found to consistently underestimate the IOP both in the anterior chamber and vitrectomized vitreous chamber. Relative to the imposed pressure, results from tonometry exhibit a significantly greater error than our needle-based sensor device. With increased pressure ( $>30$  mmHg), the error of the Tonopen increased, while the error of our device does not. The 30-gauge needle produces an insignificant improvement in accuracy over the 33-gauge needle.

**Conclusions:** This needle-based sensor device enables accurate IOP mea-

surements in the anterior chamber and post-vitrectomy vitreous chamber.

**Translational relevance:** Direct measure of IOP in the anterior and vitreous chambers provides a practical alternative for patients with altered corneal biomechanics.

---

Total word count: 3339

Tables : 1, Figures: 7

---

\*rweinreb@ucsd.edu

<sup>1</sup>jfriend@ucsd.edu

## 1. Introduction

Intraocular pressure (IOP) is the primary modifiable risk factor in the development and progression of glaucoma. Reliable measurements of IOP are crucial in the management of this sight-threatening disease. The gold standard for IOP measurement for more than 50 years has been Goldmann applanation tonometry (GAT).<sup>1</sup> GAT is a non-invasive measurement technique that infers IOP from the force required to flatten a portion of the cornea. However, accurate GAT assessment of IOP is dependent on an ideal eye and can be affected by many factors including corneal thickness, corneal curvature, and irregular corneal biomechanical properties.<sup>2</sup> Furthermore, GAT is not possible in patients with a Boston keratoprosthesis (KPro) due to the inelasticity of the implant.

New technologies have attempted to address the shortcomings of GAT. The accuracy of Dynamic Contour Tonometry is less affected by corneal thickness than corneal curvature.<sup>3</sup> The Ocular Response Analyzer likewise is less influenced by corneal properties and provides measures of corneal biomechanics through corneal hysteresis.<sup>4</sup> The Diaton tonometer measures IOP through transpalpebral tonometry, and can be used to measure IOP in KPro patients, but the device is not very accurate.<sup>5</sup> Implantable IOP measurement devices circumvent potential artifacts by directly measuring IOP but require a surgical procedure.<sup>6,7</sup>

Intravitreal injections for the treatment of retinal disorders are performed millions of times per year.<sup>8</sup> Intravitreal injections have been widely adopted due to their favorable safety profile, with infections associated with fewer than 1 in 6,000 injections.<sup>9</sup> Anterior chamber paracentesis is less common but is also safe and has a low risk of iatrogenic complications.<sup>10</sup> This presents the possibility of directly measuring intraocular pressure in the anterior or vitreous chambers. Advances in micro-manometric technology have made this increasingly feasible for the clinician. Here, we present a novel direct IOP measurement device that provides rapid and accurate measurements and is independent of the cornea. The device was tested *ex vivo* in rabbits and accurately measured IOP in the anterior chamber and vitreous chamber of vitrectomized eyes.

## 2. Methods

### Micromanometry System:

36 A high-resolution pressure sensor (2SMPP-03, OMRON, Kyoto, Japan)  
 37 was integrated with a custom designed circuit that enables obtaining ac-  
 38 curate measurements of the IOP via a USB interface as shown in Figure  
 39 1. The pressure sensor and circuit were assembled in a custom designed, 3D  
 40 printed, and palm-sized housing. A 30- or 33-gauge needle (PRE-33013, TSK  
 41 Laboratory, Japan) was primed with sterile balanced salt solution (BSS) and  
 42 connected to a pressure sensor through a luer lock mechanism. Analog signal  
 43 delivered from the pressure sensor was converted to digital via an Arduino  
 44 Due (ADU, A000062, Arduino, Ivrea, Italy) board at an acquisition rate of  
 45 50ms (20Hz). Internal circuitry ensures that pressures outside the measure-  
 46 ment range do not create voltages large enough to damage the Arduino Due.  
 47 This is achieved via a Wheatstone bridge built into the pressure sensor. The  
 48 voltage is then amplified with a precise gain using an instrumentation ampli-  
 49 fier (INA126, Texas Instruments, Dallas, TX, USA) that sets the sensitivity  
 50 of the pressure measurement. The output is then limited using two limiter  
 51 circuits; one for the upper bound and the other for the lower bound of the  
 52 expected pressure range. The upper and lower bounds are set by the inter-  
 53 nal ADC of the Arduino Due, but the sensitivity of the measurement can be  
 54 changed by adjusting the feedback resistor of the instrumentation amplifier.  
 55 The internal Arduino Due ADC then digitizes the analog signal at a user-  
 56 defined sampling rate. The digital signal transmitted to a computer through  
 57 a standard USB interface was used to infer the output reading in mm Hg  
 58 based on calibration measures described below.




Figure 1: a) Illustration of the device acquisition set-up. b) Image of the circuit and disposable part which get assembled in a custom 3D printed housing.

**Calibration and Testing:** A high-resolution microfluidics pressure control system (microfluidics control, OB1, Elveflow<sup>®</sup>, Paris, France) was used to control the pressure imposed on the pressure sensor to produce a calibration curve. This was obtained in the first instance by connecting the microfluidics control system to the sensor needle through an elastic membrane to better represent an actual eye. This test was conducted to ensure the sensitivity of the micro-manometric system was sufficient to capture the changes imposed by the microfluidics control system and subsequently obtain the calibration equation for the sensor. An elastic *ex vivo* model of the eye was constructed to which the microfluidics control system was connected using a 25-gauge (25G 1, BD Eclipse<sup>®</sup>, NJ, USA) needle. The elastic model is a closed membrane chamber comprised of a polymer with mechanical properties similar to a cornea.<sup>11</sup> The membrane chamber was filled with BSS and a vacuum chamber was used to eliminate dissolved air that could later lead to entrapped air bubbles. The microfluidics control system added or removed BSS in the membrane chamber to increase or decrease the pressure of the system. The needle sensor device was connected to the closed chamber with either of two needle sizes (30-g  $\times$  1/2 in and 33-g  $\times$  1/2 in) and the pressure was varied using the microfluidics control system. Sensor readings were recorded while increasing the pressure from 0 to 103.4 mm Hg (2 Psi), and back to 0 with steps of 10.3 mm Hg (0.2 Psi). The readings were used to calibrate the sensor relative to the pressure imposed by the microfluidics control system. Standard regression analysis was used to compute the  $R^2$  values and establish a linear correlation between the sensor readings ( $S$ ) and the imposed pressure ( $P_{IN}$ ) such that:  $S = aP_{IN} + b$ , where  $a$  and  $b$  are correlation coefficients.

The sensor needle device was then tested in *ex vivo* rabbit eyes. The microfluidics control system was connected to a 25-gauge needle and inserted into the anterior chamber of the eyes. The sensor needle was then inserted into the anterior chamber and likewise maintained in a fixed position on a stabilizer arm as shown in Figure 2. Two needle sizes, 30-g  $\times$  1/2 in and 33-g  $\times$  1/2 in, were used to obtain sensor readings for the pressure changes in the anterior chamber. The input pressure in the anterior chamber pressure was varied from 0 to 103.4 mm Hg (2 Psi) in 10 mm Hg (0.2 Psi) increments. The device was evaluated using the calibration equation from the elastic membrane chamber,  $P_M = \frac{S-b}{a}$ , where  $P_M$  is the measured pressure,  $S$  is the sensor reading,  $a$  and  $b$  are the linear correlation coefficients. The IOP was also measured using a Tonopen following the device reading for each

97 increment in pressure. Measurements were repeated for five eyes using both  
 98 needle sizes (10 eyes total).




Figure 2: a) Image of the test setup in rabbit eyes, b) illustration of supply pressure and sensor needle. The 25 g needle was used to supply pressure from the microfluidics control system and the sensor needle used to measure the pressure change in the anterior chamber.

99 The tests were repeated in the vitreous chamber of vitrectomized rabbit  
 100 eyes. Similar to the anterior chamber measurements, a 25 g needle attached  
 101 to the microfluidics control system was inserted into the vitreous chamber  
 102 and held in a fixed position using a stabilizer arm. The sensor needle was  
 103 inserted into the vitreous chamber and two needle sizes, 30-g  $\times$   $\frac{1}{2}$  in and 33-  
 104 g  $\times$   $\frac{1}{2}$  in, were again used to measure the pressure changes in the vitreous  
 105 chamber. The pressure imposed by the microfluidics control system was  
 106 varied from 0 to 103.4 mm Hg (2 Psi) in 10 mm Hg (0.2 Psi) increments and  
 107 sensor readings taken at each increment. The IOP was also measured using  
 108 a Tonopen simultaneously with the sensor readings.

### 109 3. Results

110 **Calibration:** The sensor of the micro-manometry system was tested  
 111 through a connection to an elastic membrane chamber that exhibits a linear  
 112 relationship with the pressure imposed by the microfluidics control system  
 113 for both the needles, 30-g  $\times$   $\frac{1}{2}$  in and 33-g  $\times$   $\frac{1}{2}$  in. Scatter plots of the  
 114 pressure recorded by the sensor needle device against the pressure imposed  
 115 by the microfluidics control system are shown in Figure 3.




Figure 3: Sensor needle device readings obtained by connection to the microfluidics control system in an elastic membrane chamber using  $30\text{-g} \times \frac{1}{2}$  in and  $33\text{-g} \times \frac{1}{2}$  in needles.

116 The sensor reading is linearly dependent ( $R^2 > 0.99$ ) over 0 to 103.4 mm  
 117 Hg, and the change in the reading in replacing a 30-g needle with a 33-g needle  
 118 is insignificant according to a paired T-test ( $p < 0.05$ ). The results indicate  
 119 the sensitivity of the device is sufficient to capture the changes imposed by  
 120 the microfluidics control system over a pressure range of 0 to 103.4 mm Hg  
 121 (2 Psi), with increments of 10.3 mm Hg (0.2 Psi). The calibration equations  
 122 for the sensor in an elastic membrane chamber measurements are shown in  
 123 Table 1, where the sensor reading,  $S$ , is expressed as a linear function of the  
 124 imposed pressure,  $P_{IN}$ .

Table 1: Sensor needle device calibration equations.

Equation	Needle	
$S = aP_{IN} + b$	30-g	33-g
a	4.16	4.18
b	-13	-17

125 ***Ex vivo* Rabbit eyes:** The same test was conducted in rabbit eyes,



126 with the sensor acquisition rate at 50ms (20Hz) for both the needles, 30-g  $\times$   
 127  $1/2$  in and 33-g  $\times$   $1/2$  in. The calibration equations from the elastic membrane  
 128 chamber (Table 1) were used to infer the IOP from the sensor needle device  
 129 such that:  $P_M = \frac{S+13}{4.16}$  (30-g needle) and  $P_M = \frac{S+17}{4.18}$  (33-g needle), where  
 130  $P_M$  is the measured pressure and  $S$  is the sensor reading. The sensor device  
 131 measurements were compared against those obtained by the Tonopen. The  
 132 results in Figure 4 demonstrate the accuracy of the device with a strong linear  
 133 correlation between the imposed ( $P_{IN}$ , x-axis) and measured ( $P_M$ , y-axis)  
 134 pressure for both the 30-g and 33-g needles. The coefficient of determination  
 135 ( $R^2$ ) was excellent for both needle sizes ( $R^2 = 1.0$  and  $0.99$  for the 30-  
 136 and 33-g needles, respectively), and the tonopen in both trials ( $R^2 = 0.98$   
 137 and  $0.99$ ). The data was confirmed to be normal via the Shapiro-Wilk test  
 138 with significance  $p < 0.05$  and  $n = 10$ . Pooled variances for the readings  
 139 were used to determine the average standard deviation of each measurement  
 140 device. The average standard deviation of the 30- and 33-g needles (1.32 and  
 141 2.7 mm Hg, respectively) were much smaller than that of the Tonopen in  
 142 either trial (6.12 and 9.02 mm Hg, respectively).




Figure 4: **Anterior chamber pressure measurements using the sensor needle device and tonometry for a) 30-g Needle, b) 33-g Needle.**

143 The relative error was evaluated as  $\frac{P_{IN}-P_M}{P_E}$ , where  $P_{IN}$  is the pressure im-  
 144 posed by the microfluidics control system, and  $P_M$  is the pressure measured

by either the sensor needle device or the Tonopen. The Tonopen underestimates the delivered pressure, particularly at higher pressures, where the relative error for readings obtained by the Tonopen compared to the sensor needle are significantly larger as shown in Figure 5. In contrast, the sensor needle device exhibits higher accuracy at higher pressures.




Figure 5: **Error in the anterior chamber pressure measurements using the sensor needle device and tonometry for a) 30-g Needle, b) 33-g Needle.**

The tests were repeated in the vitreous chamber of vitrectomized rabbit eyes. Results in Figure 6 show the coefficient of determination was excellent for both needle sizes ( $R^2 = 1$  and 0.998 for 30- and 33-g needles, respectively). By comparison, the Tonopen readings exhibit a slightly lower coefficient of determination ( $R^2 = 0.97$  and 0.98, for tests with the 30- and 33-g needles, respectively).




Figure 6: **Vitreous chamber pressure measurements obtained using the sensor needle device and tonometry for a) 30-g Needle, b) 33-g Needle.**

156 The Tonopen also underestimates the pressure readings by over 20% on  
 157 average as shown in Figure 7. The slightly higher error for the 33-g in  
 158 comparison to the 30-g needle can be attributed to the loss in pressure trans-  
 159 mission across the smaller needles' lumen when transmitting pressure from  
 160 the vitreous chamber to the pressure sensor.




Figure 7: **Error in the vitreous chamber pressure measurements using the sensor needle device and tonometry for a) 30-g Needle, b) 33-g Needle. As the imposed pressure,  $P_{IN}$  increases, the error for the readings obtained by tonometry fluctuate or get larger while the sensor needle device stabilizes.**

#### 161 4. Discussion

162 Advances in microfabrication have allowed the construction of increas-  
 163 ingly sophisticated devices well suited to the small dimensions of the eye.  
 164 Using the technology described above, a high-resolution pressure sensor was  
 165 integrated with a 30- and 33-gauge needle to accurately and reliably measure  
 166 IOP in the anterior and vitreous chambers. Notably, the device provides a  
 167 direct measure of IOP that is not affected by corneal properties. The device  
 168 accurately measured IOP in the anterior chamber over a clinically significant  
 169 range of 10 – 100 mm Hg (Figure 4), opening avenue for its translation to  
 170 use in patients with altered corneal biomechanics. In contrast, the Tonopen  
 171 underestimated the IOP, particularly at higher pressures. This finding is  
 172 consistent with prior studies showing the Tonopen underestimates IOP in  
 173 rabbits.<sup>12</sup>

174 IOP measurements in rabbits can be corrected to account for thinner  
 175 corneas leading to the underestimation of their IOP.<sup>13</sup> Similar correction  
 176 factors exist for humans, but their use may not lead to increased accuracy in  
 177 IOP estimation due to many other factors that may induce artifacts.<sup>14</sup> More  
 178 complex models that attempt to address additional factors such as the mod-  
 179 ulus of elasticity are still prone to error.<sup>15,16</sup> A history of refractive surgery  
 180 may lead to further inaccuracies in the measurement of IOP due to thin-  
 181 ning of the cornea, changes in the corneal curvature, and alterations in the

182 corneal biomechanical properties.<sup>17–19</sup> Corneal scars may influence IOP in  
183 even more unpredictable ways due to their varying sizes, depths, and effects  
184 on the cornea’s biomechanical properties.<sup>20</sup> All of these potential sources of  
185 error are frequently encountered in the clinical setting, yet there are limited  
186 means to address them. Our device allows for an accurate measurement of  
187 IOP in any of these cases. The patient may not need this measurement  
188 repeated at every visit if the results are reassuring or can be correlated to  
189 GAT or another non-invasive measurement technique. However, the oppor-  
190 tunity for direct IOP measurement would be a useful addition to a clinician’s  
191 armamentarium.

192 The device also accurately measured IOP in the vitreous chamber af-  
193 ter vitrectomy (Figure 6). We were unable to measure IOP in the vitreous  
194 chamber without vitrectomy because vitreous rapidly clogged the measure-  
195 ment needle, voiding the sensor reading. A similar result was found in prior  
196 cannulation studies.<sup>21</sup> However, despite this limitation, direct measurement  
197 of IOP in the vitreous chamber following vitrectomy is clinically useful. As  
198 many as 60% of Kpro patients develop glaucoma, but the disease is difficult  
199 to manage due to the inability to accurately measure IOP.<sup>22</sup> Management  
200 of chronic vision-threatening complications like glaucoma in Kpro patients  
201 is becoming increasingly important as early complications such as endoph-  
202 thalmitis or device extrusion are becoming less common.<sup>23,24</sup> Many Kpro  
203 patients receive vitrectomies at the time of Kpro implantation. These pa-  
204 tients may benefit enormously from the accurate measurement of IOP in the  
205 vitreous chamber.

206 Telemetric IOP monitors have been implanted into a small cohort of KPro  
207 patients and offers an alternative method for direct measurement of IOP in  
208 these patients.<sup>25</sup> However, three of twelve devices were explanted over the  
209 course of a year and there were concerns for potential adverse events associ-  
210 ated with the devices. Our device may offer a safe alternative in Kpro pa-  
211 tients. Interestingly, data from the implantable IOP monitors were compared  
212 to anterior chamber manometry.<sup>26</sup> This suggests that it may be possible to  
213 measure IOP using our device in KPro patients even without vitrectomy.  
214 However, serial anterior segment imaging has demonstrated progressive an-  
215 gle closure and shallowing of the anterior chamber in KPro patients, so an-  
216 terior chamber measurements may still not be viable over the long term.<sup>27</sup>  
217 Implantable devices also face issues of measurement drift over the lifetime of  
218 the device.<sup>28,29</sup> Implantable devices can be re-calibrated to correct for drift  
219 by performing GAT in healthy eyes, but this is not possible in KPro patients.

220 Our device may be useful for re-calibration of implantable devices as their  
221 safety profiles become more acceptable.

222 The use of the term “gold standard” to describe a diagnostic technique  
223 or therapeutic intervention has been criticized as inaccurate or misleading  
224 due to the rapidly evolving state of medical care.<sup>30,31</sup> Nonetheless, GAT has  
225 long been referred to as the gold standard for IOP measurement.<sup>1</sup> How-  
226 ever, accurate measurement of IOP by GAT is hampered by the corneal  
227 and biomechanical artifacts discussed above. Anterior chamber cannulation  
228 manometry in animal models allows for accurate IOP measurement but was  
229 previously hampered by the invasiveness of the technique.<sup>32,33</sup> Now, micro-  
230 fabrication techniques allow clinicians to directly measure IOP through the  
231 use of implantable devices or minimally invasive procedures. Thus, a true  
232 IOP is measured rather than the surrogate IOP measured by non-invasive  
233 techniques. We propose that these new methods will become the true gold  
234 standard for IOP measurement as they become more broadly applicable.

235 This study had several limitations. First, the study was performed en-  
236 tirely in *ex vivo* models so the potential long-term complication rates of  
237 direct measurement of IOP in the anterior and vitreous chambers are un-  
238 known. However, the safety profiles of anterior chamber paracentesis and  
239 intravitreal injections offer promise for a similarly safe procedure that could  
240 be performed in an office setting. Second, we performed vitreous chamber  
241 measurements in only two eyes. The difficulty of fully closing sclerotomies  
242 following vitrectomy led to unstable eyes and variable IOP measurements at  
243 higher pressures. Eyes that are allowed to heal and develop fully watertight  
244 closures following vitrectomy are not expected to face similar inaccuracies.  
245 Finally, the current device requires a USB connection to a computer to ob-  
246 tain readings, future iterations adapting advancements in wireless technology  
247 would enable further miniaturization and portability, paving the way for clin-  
248 ical translation of the device in humans.

#### 249 **Acknowledgments:**

250 This work was performed in part at the San Diego Nanotechnology Infras-  
251 tructure (SDNI) of UCSD, a member of the National Nanotechnology Co-  
252 ordinated Infrastructure, which is supported by the National Science Foun-  
253 dation (Grant ECCS-1542148). The work presented here was generously  
254 supported by a research grant from the state of California via AB2664. The  
255 work was also supported by a National Institutes of Health/National Eye

256 Institute Core Grant P30EY022589 and an unrestricted grant from Research  
257 to Prevent Blindness (New York, NY).  
258 Disclosure: **T. Gopesh**, None; **A. Camp**, None; **M. Unanian**, None; **J.**  
259 **Friend**, None; **R. Weinreb**: Aerie Pharmaceuticals, Allergan, Eyenovia,  
260 Implantdata, F: Heidelberg Engineering, Carl Zeiss Meditec, Genentech, Ko-  
261 nan, Optovue, Topcon, Optos, Centervue, Bausch & Lomb; P: Toromedes,  
262 Meditec-Zeiss.

## References

- [1] Michael A Kass. Standardizing the measurement of intraocular pressure for clinical research: guidelines from the eye care technology forum. *Ophthalmology*, 103(1):183–185, 1996.
- [2] Marc M Whitacre and Richard Stein. Sources of error with use of goldmann-type tonometers. *Survey of ophthalmology*, 38(1):1–30, 1993.
- [3] Brian A Francis, Amy Hsieh, Mei-Ying Lai, Vikas Chopra, Fernando Pena, Stanley Azen, Rohit Varma, Los Angeles Latino Eye Study Group, et al. Effects of corneal thickness, corneal curvature, and intraocular pressure level on goldmann applanation tonometry and dynamic contour tonometry. *Ophthalmology*, 114(1):20–26, 2007.
- [4] Felipe A Medeiros and Robert N Weinreb. Evaluation of the influence of corneal biomechanical properties on intraocular pressure measurements using the ocular response analyzer. *Journal of glaucoma*, 15(5):364–370, 2006.
- [5] Justin M Risma, Shandiz Tehrani, Kai Wang, John H Fingert, Wallace LM Alward, and Young H Kwon. The utility of diaton tonometer measurements in patients with ocular hypertension, glaucoma, and glaucoma tube shunts: a preliminary study for its potential use in keratoprosthesis patients. *Journal of glaucoma*, 25(8):643–647, 2016.
- [6] Ismail E Araci, Baolong Su, Stephen R Quake, and Yossi Mandel. An implantable microfluidic device for self-monitoring of intraocular pressure. *Nature medicine*, 20(9):1074, 2014.
- [7] Eleftherios I Paschalis, Fabiano Cade, Samir Melki, Louis R Pasquale, Claes H Dohlman, and Joseph B Ciolino. Reliable intraocular pressure measurement using automated radio-wave telemetry. *Clinical Ophthalmology (Auckland, NZ)*, 8:177, 2014.
- [8] GA Williams. Ivt injections: health policy implications. *Rev Ophthalmol*, 21(6):62–64, 2014.
- [9] Kunyong Xu, Eric K Chin, Steven R Bennett, David F Williams, Edwin H Ryan, Sundeep Dev, Robert A Mittra, Polly A Quiram, John B Davies, D Wilkin Parke III, et al. Endophthalmitis after intravitreal



- 295 injection of vascular endothelial growth factor inhibitors: Management  
296 and visual outcomes. *Ophthalmology*, 2018.
- 297 [10] Deepali Trivedi, Alastair KO Denniston, and Philip I Murray. Safety  
298 profile of anterior chamber paracentesis performed at the slit lamp. *Clin-  
299 ical & experimental ophthalmology*, 39(8):725–728, 2011.
- 300 [11] Julie A Last, Sara J Liliensiek, Paul F Nealey, and Christopher J Mur-  
301 phy. Determining the mechanical properties of human corneal basement  
302 membranes with atomic force microscopy. *Journal of structural biology*,  
303 167(1):19–24, 2009.
- 304 [12] K Sheng Lim, Sanjeewa S Wickremasinghe, M Francesca Cordeiro,  
305 Catey Bunce, and Peng T Khaw. Accuracy of intraocular pressure mea-  
306 surements in new zealand white rabbits. *Investigative ophthalmology &  
307 visual science*, 46(7):2419–2423, 2005.
- 308 [13] Marian Löbner, Annelie Rehmer, Rudolf Guthoff, Heiner Martin, Katrin  
309 Sternberg, and Oliver Stachs. Suitability and calibration of a rebound  
310 tonometer to measure iop in rabbit and pig eyes. *Veterinary ophthal-  
311 mology*, 14(1):66–68, 2011.
- 312 [14] Pinakin Gunvant, Robert D Newcomb, Elliot M Kirstein, Victor E Mali-  
313 novsky, Richard J Madonna, and Richard E Meetz. Measuring accurate  
314 iops: Does correction factor help or hurt? *Clinical ophthalmology (Auck-  
315 land, NZ)*, 4:611, 2010.
- 316 [15] Pinakin Gunvant, Daniel James O’leary, Mani Baskaran, David Charles  
317 Broadway, Russell Julian Watkins, and Lingam Vijaya. Evaluation of  
318 tonometric correction factors. *Journal of glaucoma*, 14(5):337–343, 2005.
- 319 [16] Girma J Orssengo and David C Pye. Determination of the true intraoc-  
320 ular pressure and modulus of elasticity of the human cornea in vivo.  
321 *Bulletin of mathematical biology*, 61(3):551–572, 1999.
- 322 [17] Daniel H Chang and R Doyle Stulting. Change in intraocular pressure  
323 measurements after lasik: the effect of the refractive correction and the  
324 lamellar flap. *Ophthalmology*, 112(6):1009–1016, 2005.
- 325 [18] Joshua S Hardin, Christopher I Lee, Lydia F Lane, Christian C Hester,  
326 and R Grant Morshedi. Corneal hysteresis in post-radial keratotomy

- 327 primary open-angle glaucoma. *Graefe's Archive for Clinical and Exper-*  
328 *imental Ophthalmology*, 256(10):1971–1976, 2018.
- 329 [19] Po-Jen Shih, I-Jong Wang, Wen-Feng Cai, and Jia-Yush Yen. Biome-  
330 chanical simulation of stress concentration and intraocular pressure in  
331 corneas subjected to myopic refractive surgical procedures. *Scientific*  
332 *reports*, 7(1):13906, 2017.
- 333 [20] Arun K Jain, Jagjit S Saini, Rajeev Gupta, et al. Tonometry in normal  
334 and scarred corneas, and in postkeratoplasty eyes: A comparative study  
335 of the goldmann, the proton and the schiottz tonometers. *Indian journal*  
336 *of ophthalmology*, 48(1):25, 2000.
- 337 [21] José Luis Hernández-Verdejo, Miguel A Teus, and Gema Bolivar. Simul-  
338 taneous measurement of intraocular pressure in the anterior chamber  
339 and the vitreous cavity. *Acta ophthalmologica*, 88(7):e265–e268, 2010.
- 340 [22] Peter A Netland, Hisao Terada, and Claes H Dohlman. Glaucoma as-  
341 sociated with keratoprosthesis1. *Ophthalmology*, 105(4):751–757, 1998.
- 342 [23] Ramon Lee, Ziad Khoueir, Edem Tsikata, James Chodosh, Claes H  
343 Dohlman, and Teresa C Chen. Long-term visual outcomes and compli-  
344 cations of boston keratoprosthesis type ii implantation. *Ophthalmology*,  
345 124(1):27–35, 2017.
- 346 [24] Allister Gibbons, Ella H Leung, Luis J Haddock, Carlos A Medina,  
347 Viviana Fernandez, Jean-Marie A Parel, Heather A Durkee, Guillermo  
348 Amescua, Eduardo C Alfonso, and Victor L Perez. Long-term outcomes  
349 of the aphakic snap-on boston type i keratoprosthesis at the bascom  
350 palmer eye institute. *Clinical Ophthalmology (Auckland, NZ)*, 12:331,  
351 2018.
- 352 [25] Philip Enders, Jonathan Hall, Marco Bornhauser, Kaweh Mansouri, Le-  
353 briz Altay, Stefan Schrader, Thomas S Dietlein, Bjoern O Bachmann,  
354 Thomas Neuhaus, and Claus Cursiefen. Telemetric intraocular pres-  
355 sure monitoring after boston keratoprosthesis surgery. *Ophthalmology*,  
356 126(2):322, 2019.
- 357 [26] Jeong Oen Lee, Haeri Park, Juan Du, Ashwin Balakrishna, Oliver Chen,  
358 David Sretavan, and Hyuck Choo. A microscale optical implant for

- 359 continuous in vivo monitoring of intraocular pressure. *Microsystems &*  
360 *Nanoengineering*, 3:17057, 2017.
- 361 [27] Joann J Kang, Norma Allemann, Jose De La Cruz, and Maria Soledad  
362 Cortina. Serial analysis of anterior chamber depth and angle status using  
363 anterior segment optical coherence tomography after boston keratopros-  
364 thesis. *Cornea*, 32(10):1369–1374, 2013.
- 365 [28] J Crawford Downs, Claude F Burgoyne, William P Seigfreid, Juan F  
366 Reynaud, Nicholas G Strouthidis, and Verney Sallee. 24-hour iop teleme-  
367 try in the nonhuman primate: implant system performance and initial  
368 characterization of iop at multiple timescales. *Investigative ophthalmol-  
369 ogy & visual science*, 52(10):7365–7375, 2011.
- 370 [29] Lawrence Yu, Brian Kim, and Ellis Meng. Chronically implanted pres-  
371 sure sensors: challenges and state of the field. *Sensors*, 14(11):20620–  
372 20644, 2014.
- 373 [30] P Finbarr Duggan. Time to abolish “gold standard”. *BMJ: British  
374 Medical Journal*, 304(6841):1568, 1992.
- 375 [31] David S Jones and Scott H Podolsky. The history and fate of the gold  
376 standard. *The Lancet*, 385(9977):1502–1503, 2015.
- 377 [32] Jennifer A Peterson, Julie A Kiland, Mary Ann Croft, and Paul L Kauf-  
378 man. Intraocular pressure measurement in cynomolgus monkeys. tonop-  
379 open versus manometry. *Investigative ophthalmology & visual science*,  
380 37(6):1197–1199, 1996.
- 381 [33] Christy A Morris, Jonathan G Crowston, James D Lindsey, John Da-  
382 nias, and Robert N Weinreb. Comparison of invasive and non-invasive  
383 tonometry in the mouse. *Experimental eye research*, 82(6):1094–1099,  
384 2006.